Astronomy & Astrophysics manuscript no. chelli_paper1_v6
April 27, 2016
©ESO 2016

arXiv:1604.07700v1 [astro-ph.SR] 26 Apr 2016

Pseudomagnitudes and Differential Surface Brightness: Application to the apparent diameter of stars

Chelli, Alain[1], Duvert, Gilles[2, 3], Bourgès, Laurent[2, 3], Mella, Guillaume[2, 3], Lafrasse, Sylvain[2, 3], Bonneau, Daniel[1], Chesneau, Olivier[1]

[1] Laboratoire Lagrange, Université Côte d'Azur, Observatoire de la Côte d'Azur, CNRS, Blvd de l'Observatoire, F-06304 Nice, France. ⋆
[2] Univ. Grenoble Alpes, IPAG, F-38000 Grenoble, France
[3] CNRS, IPAG, F-38000 Grenoble, France

Received; Accepted

ABSTRACT

The diameter of a star is a major observable that serves to test the validity of stellar structure theories. It is also a difficult observable that is mostly obtained with indirect methods since the stars are so remote. Today only ~ 600 apparent star diameters have been measured by direct methods: optical interferometry and lunar occultations. Accurate star diameters are now required in the new field of exoplanet studies, since they condition the planets' sizes in transit observations, and recent publications illustrate a visible renewal of interest in this topic.

Our analysis is based on the modeling of the relationship between measured angular diameters and photometries. It makes use of two new reddening-free concepts: a distance indicator called pseudomagnitude, and a quasi-experimental observable that is independent of distance and specific to each star, called the differential surface brightness (DSB). The use of all the published measurements of apparent diameters that have been collected so far, and a careful modeling of the DSB allow us to estimate star diameters with a median statistical error of 1.1%, knowing their spectral type and, in the present case, the VJHKs photometries.

We introduce two catalogs, the JMMC Measured Diameters Catalog (JMDC), containing measured star diameters, and the second version of the JMMC Stellar Diameter Catalog (JSDC), augmented to about 453 000 star diameters. Finally, we provide simple formulas and a table of coefficients to quickly estimate stellar angular diameters and associated errors from (V, Ks) magnitudes and spectral types.

Key words. stars: fundamental parameters – techniques: data analysis – techniques: interferometric – astronomical database: miscellaneous – catalogs

1. Introduction

Most of our knowledge of the Universe still comes from, either directly or indirectly, an analysis of starlight. Stellar physics is used, implicitly or explicitly, in every astrophysical research field, and must be continually tested against observations. One of the most fundamental and dimensioning parameters of the physics of a star is its size, measured through its distance and its apparent angular size. The original interest in measuring stellar angular sizes was to get precise estimates of the stellar effective temperature, $T_{\rm eff}$, which is pivotal to, for example, determining ages and metallicities. But there is renewed interest, such as the precise stellar radii now needed to measure transiting exoplanets' sizes and densities, which can eventually fall into the host star's so-called habitable zone (von Braun et al. 2014).

Primary distance measurements are the realm of the space missions Hipparcos (ESA 1997) and GAIA (de Bruijne 2012). The most straightforward method to measure the angular sizes of stars is interferometry (Michelson & Pease 1921; Hanbury Brown & Twiss 1958; Labeyrie 1975), and in a less measure, more historically, lunar occultations (Cousins & Guelke 1950). Modern interferometric techniques – combining adaptive optics, mononode fibers, cophasing, fast and low noise NIR cameras – are today able to measure stellar diameters with a precision better than 1% (Cruzalèbes et al. 2013; Boyajian et al. 2012a,b). However the ultimate precision is often dominated by the calibration process. To reach very high precision, it is mandatory to know and to observe with the state of the art procedures, together with the object of interest, a star called calibrator. In other words, a single star, as close as possible to the object, with similar magnitude, with a known angular diameter and associated error, that is used to measure the transmission of the observing system. This underlines the importance of angular diameter predictions for calibration purposes. The angular diameter predictions are based on two kind of methods: the first are based on a polynomial fit of measured angular diameters as a function of colors, from Wesselink (1969) to Boyajian et al. (2013, 2014); the second, like the Infrared Flux Method (Blackwell et al. 1979; Casagrande et al. 2010), are based on a subtle mix of experimental data and modeling. Other methods, like Asteroseismology (Brown & Gilliland 1994; Chaplin & Miglio 2013), provide linear diameters that must be converted to angular diameters using a distance estimate.

Our initial motivation for this work was to optimize the calibrator-finding utility SearchCal[1] (Bonneau et al. 2006, 2011), an angular diameter estimator of the first kind described above, with a rigorous treatment of error propagation.

⋆ Correspondence: Alain.Chelli@oca.eu

[1] http://www.jmmc.fr/searchcal

The aim was to produce a more robust version of the catalog of ∼ 40 000 star diameters, the JMMC Stellar Diameter Catalog (JSDC) (Lafrasse et al. 2010). This led us to reconsider the general problem of deriving the polynomial coefficients that are used in such estimators, which usually come from star magnitudes that need to be de-reddened before use. We solved the visual extinction problem by introducing two new concepts: a distance indicator called pseudomagnitude, and the differential surface brightness (hereafter DSB), both reddening-free. The DSB is an observable specific to each star, independent of distance, which depends only on measured quantities: the stellar diameter and the observed magnitudes.

Our approach to predict stellar diameters, definitely experimental, consists of a polynomial fit of the DSB as a function of the spectral type number for a database of stars with known diameters. It allows us to by-pass the knowledge of visual extinction and that of intrinsic colors. The polynomial coefficients are then applicable to any star with a known spectral type and magnitudes to provide an apparent diameter value. As an illustration of our method, we compiled a catalog of ∼ 600 measured star diameters and photometries that we used to compute the DSB polynomial fit. Using these polynomials and all the stars in the ASCC catalog (Kharchenko 2001) that have an associated spectral type, we are able to give the apparent diameter of ∼ 453 000 stars with a median diameter precision of 1.1%, as well as possible astrophysical biases up to 2% (due to luminosity classes, DSB fine structures, metallicity, and so on), that is in agreement with the limiting precisions discussed in Casagrande et al. (2014).

Section 2 introduces the new formalism, especially the concepts of pseudomagnitudes and differential surface brightness. Section 3 describes the least squares fit approach. Section 4 describes how we built the database of measured diameters from the literature, discusses their validity, and how we tried to avoid any systematics. The results are presented and discussed in Section 5.

2. Pseudomagnitude and differential surface brightness

In this section, we introduce the concept of pseudomagnitude and a new experimental observable: the differential surface brightness (DSB). Our starting point is the expression of the surface brightness S_i of a star (Wesselink 1969), see Equation 9 of (Barnes & Evans 1976):

$$S_i = 5\log(\theta) + m_i^0, \tag{1}$$

where θ is the angular diameter of the star and m_i^0 the unreddened magnitude in the photometric band i. m_i^0 can be written as:

$$m_i^0 = m_i - c_i A_v, \tag{2}$$

where m_i is the observed magnitude, c_i is the ratio between the extinction coefficients R_i and R_v in the i and visible bands, respectively. Given two photometric bands i and j, the interstellar extinction can be writtten as

$$A_v = \frac{m_i - m_j}{c_i - c_j} - \frac{m_i^0 - m_j^0}{c_i - c_j}, \tag{3}$$

Combining the three previous equations, the surface brightness may be expressed as a function of the angular diameter, the measured magnitudes, and the intrinsic color of the star, $C_{ij} = m_i^0 - m_j^0$. That is to say

$$S_i = 5 \times \left(\log(\theta) + 0.2 \times \frac{c_i\, m_j - c_j\, m_i}{c_i - c_j} \right) + \frac{c_i}{c_i - c_j} C_{ij}. \tag{4}$$

At this point, it is useful to introduce a new stellar observable that we call pseudomagnitude, defined by

$$pm_{ij} = \frac{c_i\, m_j - c_j\, m_i}{c_i - c_j}. \tag{5}$$

The pseudomagnitudes have remarkable properties and applications that will be discussed in a forthcoming paper. Basically, they are reddening free distance indicators:

$$pm_{ij} = \mathrm{PM}_{ij} + d_M, \tag{6}$$

where PM_{ij} is the absolute pseudomagnitude, i.e., the pseudomagnitude at 10 pc distance, $d_M = 5\log(d) - 5$ is the distance modulus and d the distance in parsecs. We note that if one of the coefficients c_i or c_j tends to zero, then the pseudomagnitude tends to the magnitude m_i or m_j. Hence, the absolute pseudomagnitude is, in some way, related to the stellar luminosity.

The surface brightness may simply be rewritten as follows:

$$S_i = 5 \times \mathrm{DSB}_{ij} + \frac{c_i}{c_i - c_j} C_{ij}, \tag{7}$$

where DSB_{ij} is the DSB between the photometric bands i and j, defined as

$$\mathrm{DSB}_{ij} = \log(\theta) + 0.2\, pm_{ij}. \tag{8}$$

DSB_{ij} is a self-calibrated observable specific to each star. It is reddening-free, independent of the distance, and can be measured via photometry and interferometry. The only a priori is the diameter limb-darkening correction, which induces a diameter error that is generally less than 1%, smaller than the errors managed in this work.

The knowledge of the DSB, as a function of the spectral type, the luminosity class, the metallicity, and so on, is sufficient to predict the angular diameter of a star, given its observed magnitudes. Unfortunately, we do not possess this level of detailed information because of the poor spectral type-sampling owing to the small number of useable measured diameters (∼ 600) available today. To compensate our lack of knowledge, we fit the DSB as a function of the spectral type number n_s (varying from 0 to 69 for spectral types between O0 to M9) with simple polynomial laws. Within the present framework, if the determination of spectral type is robust to reddening (e.g., is not derived from colors), then the intrinsic color, replaced by the spectral type number, is no longer a variable of the diameter prediction problem and our approach is fully reddening-free.

3. Algorithmic approach

This is a two-step process: 1) polynomial estimate based on the DSBs derived from database values, 2) diameter calculations from polynoms and pseudomagnitudes.

3.1. Polynomial

A data point consists in a limb-darkened diameter θ and N_B photometric bands, which provides $N_B - 1$ linearly independent (but statistically dependent) equations. We can build many sets of $N_B - 1$ linearly independent equations, but each set provides the same polynomial solution. We then have to characterize, $N_B - 1$ polynomials of degree m, each associated with a pair of photometric bands. This corresponds to $(m + 1) \times (N_B - 1)$ unknowns, that we evaluate simultaneously via a simple linear least squares fit (see Appendix A.1).

Wherever possible, we used the mean interstellar extinction coefficients of Fitzpatrick (1999) that give: $(c_V, c_J, c_H, c_{Ks}) = (1.0, 0.28, 0.17, 0.12)$. Strictly speaking, the coefficients c_i depend on the spectral type (McCall 2004). In principle, one can consider variable coefficients, but for the present analysis we restrict ourselves to constant values, since the influence of these variations, with respect to diameter calculation, is smaller than the errors and the biases reported here.

Also, it may be necessary to reject anomalous data points. For example, in the production of the star diameter catalog described in Sect. 5, we use the database described in Sect. 4. From the found polynomial solution, for each entry of our database we can estimate $N_B - 1$ single diameters and a mean diameter. It sometimes occurs that one or various single diameters deviate from the mean diameter by more than 5 times the error on the difference. This may be due to observational biases in the diameter measurements, or that the star is not single, etc. In this case, we excluded the entry from the database that was used. Table 2 lists all the stars and references retained for fitting the polynomials, as discussed in Sect. 5.

3.2. Diameters

A polynomial, together with two magnitudes (pseudomagnitude), provides an estimate of the diameter. Several pairs of magnitudes gives several estimates of the same diameter. These are not statistically independent and we show in Appendix A.2 how to rigorously combine them in a single diameter value and its associated error. Beyond the error improvement, which is generally modest, the main interest of using more than two photometric bands is to produce various diameter estimates that can be recombined and, above all, compared through a quality factor, see Section 5.

4. The database of measured angular diameters

4.1. Building the database.

The empirical approach used in this paper relies on the knowledge of a statistically significant number of accurately measured angular diameters, ideally obtained with different techniques, such as avoiding as much as possible any technique-related bias. The angular diameters must be prime results, i.e., not the result of a modeling of the observations. Ideally, they should be equally distributed, both in space and in spectral type.

Several star diameter compilations exist that contain a fair amount of published angular diameters values. The CADARS (Pasinetti Fracassini et al. 2001) has entries for 6888 stars and is complete up to 1997. CHARM2 (Richichi et al. 2005) lists 8231 measurements of 3243 stars, up to 2005. However these catalogs mix results from very direct methods, such as intensity interferometry with indirect methods, or spectrophotometric estimates of various kind (always including some model of the star), or linear diameters from eclipsing binaries (1600 entries in CADARS), which need some modelling of the two stars, as well as a good estimate of the distance to be converted into an angular diameter.

Another difficulty is that, the published angular diameters have been obtained at various wavelengths and may include, or not, a compensation for the limb-darkening effect. As a result, we initiated a new compilation of measured stellar diameters that would suit our needs. This database, called JMDC[2], only uses direct methods, merges multiwavelength measurements into one value of limb-darkened diameter (LDD), and aims to be complete up to the most recent publications by being updated on a regular basis through a peer-reviewed submission process.

The JMDC used in this paper gathers 1072 apparent diameter values that have been published since the first experiments by Michelson. Prior to 1997, our bibliography relies only on the reference list of Pasinetti Fracassini et al. (2001). After this date we used NASA's ADS hosted at CDS. We retained only the measurements obtained from visible/IR interferometry, intensity interferometry and lunar occultation in the database. We always retrieved the values in the original text[3] and used SIMBAD to properly and uniquely identify the stars.

The three techniques retained share the same method of converting the measurements (squared visibilities for optical interferometry, correlation of photon-counts for intensity interferometry, fast photometry for lunar occultations) into an angular diameter: fitting a geometrical function into the values, in many cases a uniform disk, which provides a uniform disk diameter (UDD) value. This UDD is wavelength-dependent owing to the limb-darkening effect of the upper layers of a star's photosphere, and JMDC retains the wavelength or photometric band at which the observation was made.

To measure a star's apparent diameter consistently, i.e., with the same meaning as our Sun's well-resolved apparent diameter, it was necessary for the authors of these measurements to take into account the star's limb-darkening, for which only theoretical estimates exist as yet. They chose one of the various limb-darkening parameters available in the literature (see Claret (2000) for a discussion on the classical limb-darkening functions used), either by multiplying the UDD by a coefficient function of the wavelength and the star's adopted effective temperature, or directly fitting a limb-darkened disk model in the data. Of course this adds some amount of theoretical bias in the published measurements, which however diminishes as the wavelength increases. An additional difficulty for the lunar occultations is that the result depends on the exact geometry of the occulting portion of the lunar limb, which can, more or less, be correctly estimated.

To deal with the limb-darkening problem as efficiently as possible, in the publications where reported diameters are measured in several optical/IR bands, we retained the measurement with the best accuracy and favored the measurement at the longest wavelength to minimize the effect of limb-darkening correction. Furthermore, we further used the published UDD measurement, or retrieved the original, unpublished UDD measurement from the LDD value and the limb-darkening coefficient used by the authors, and uniformly converted these UDD values into limb-darkened angular diameters using the most recent correction factors published (Neilson & Lester 2013a,b), when possible. This, in our opinion, works towards minimizing the bi-

[2] JMMC Measured stellar Diameters Catalog, available at http://www.jmmc.fr/jmdc

[3] with the exception of a few very old references in CADARS that were not easily available at our location.

ases of the database, which will be confirmed afterwards by the statistical analysis of our results.

We did not keep any other information from the original references. Instead, we retrieved all the ancillary information such as photometries, parallaxes, spectral types etc, at once by using our `GetStar` service, a specially crafted version of our `SearchCal` server[4] that fetches all relevant information from a dozen CDS-based catalogs (VizieR, Simbad for object and spectral types). This ensures that there is no difference in the origin, thus no added bias, between the database we use to derive our polynomials (see below) and those that will be used in the reverse process, for any object known by Simbad at CDS.

4.2. Database properties

As of today, the database retains 1072 different measurements on 627 stars from 169 publications. Of them, 204 stars have multiple entries, from 2 (205 stars) to 18 (α Tau). In addition, 1041 measurements have an UDD value, 565 reported an LDD value. After an eventual LDD to UDD conversion and use of the above-mentioned conversion factors (for compatible spectral types), we are left with 853 entries with useable LDD measurements.

With regard to the techniques, data is issued from long-baseline optical/IR interferometry (68%), then lunar occultations (26%), and finally intensity interferometry (6%). Of the measurements retained, 36% are in the K band (around 2200 nm), the rest being equally distributed between the B,V, R, I, and H bands.

4.3. Database final filtering

For the purposes of this work (single stars of classical spectral types), we remove the known multiples or strongly variable stars (cepheids, miras, close doubles[5], spectroscopic binaries, elliptical variables etc) to obtain a set of (apparently) standard stars. In addition, we consider only stars with the following complete information: VJHKs magnitudes and errors[6]; SIMBAD spectral types within half a subclass precision; LDD diameters and their errors. Finally, keeping only measurements with an S/N above five for LDDs, we are left with 573 measurements of 404 distinct stars.

The spectral types of the 573 selected measurements range from O5 to M7 in five luminosity classes: 124 dwarves (V), 42 subgiants (IV), 297 giants (III), 38 subsupergiants (II), 56 supergiants (I), and 16 without luminosity class (in the SIMBAD database). The diameter measurements range over more than two decades, from 0.23 to 44 mas.

5. Results and discussion

To derive the polynomial coefficients and their errors, we used the 573 selected measurements of our database (see Section 4.3), and simultaneously fitted the DSB of the photometric pairs (V,J), (V,H), and (V,Ks).

[4] http://www.jmmc.fr/getstar

[5] Of separation less than one arc second.

[6] Our GetStar service is used to retrieve Johnson V magnitudes from the ASCC (Kharchenko 2001) and Hipparcos (ESA 1997) catalogs, and JHKs from 2MASS (Skrutskie et al. 2006). GetStar makes a careful cross-match on the stellar properties reported in these catalogs, comparing them with Simbad values, and takes into account proper motions in its cross-matching.



Fig. 1. Histogram of retained stellar diameter measurements for the DSB polynomial fit. Top: Note the overabundance of luminosity classes I, II, and III (363 entries), around K and M spectral types and the poor sampling for earlier ones; Bottom: Spectral distribution for luminosity classes IV and V (150 entries).

The quality of the polynomial fit is evaluated by the associated chi-square, χ^2_p (see Appendix A.1), and that of the reconstructed diameters by the mean diameter chi-square $\langle\chi^2_\theta\rangle$, (see Appendix A.2).

5.1. Influence of luminosity class

To test the influence of the luminosity class (LC), we first computed three sets of polynomials of degree 6 separately, from: 1) LC I, II and III ($\chi^2_p = 0.6, \langle\chi^2_\theta\rangle = 0.6$); 2) LC IV and V ($\chi^2_p = 0.8, \langle\chi^2_\theta\rangle = 0.7$); and 3) all, including unknown LC ($\chi^2_p = 0.7, \langle\chi^2_\theta\rangle = 0.7$). Then in each case, we computed the angular diameters of all stars of the Hipparcos (ESA 1997) catalog with known spectral types and magnitudes (93 142 stars). Within an rms bias of 2%, we found no difference between cases 1) and 3), and cases 2) and 3). As a consequence, we decided to use all the selected measurements of our database, irrespective of their luminosity class (or absence thereof), to derive a single set of polynomials that is applicable to all stars.

5.2. Selected database measurements and their DSB

From the initial 573 entries, 526 (92%) filled the fitting condition (see end of Section 3.1) and were retained for polynomial calculations (363 entries with LC I, II, and III, 150 with LC IV and V, and 13 with unknown LC). The spectral type distribution for luminosities classes I, II, and III is shown in Figure 1(top). There is an overabundance of measurements around K and M spectral types and a poor sampling for earlier ones. Instead, for luminosity classes IV and V (Figure 1, bottom) the spectral types are quite well distributed between B and M types. Also note that 100% (31 entries) of interferometry intensity data, 92% (407 entries) of classical interferometry data and 87% (88 entries) of lunar occultation data, have been retained.



Fig. 2. DSB values in the three selected photometric pairs, together with polynomial fits of degree 6 (dotted lines), as a function of the spectral type. The entries were binned separately, with an interval of one subspectral type, for LC I, II, and III (filled circles) and LC IV and V (open circles), to understand their similarity.

Figure 2 shows the DSB in the three selected photometric pairs as a function of the spectral type, together with the polynomial fit. The entries were binned, with an interval of one subspectral type, separately for LC I, II and III (filled circles) and LC IV and V (open circles), to understand their similarity. Figure 3 shows the same DSB with all entries binned with an interval of 2.5 subspectral type. It is clear that the spectral metric is not smooth, especially for the (V,J) pair. It presents a period of about one spectral type plus some possible fine structures. In fact no polynomial of reasonable degree is able to reproduce the exact structure of the DSB and we must always keep in mind the 2% rms bias on the diameter.

5.3. Comparison of diameter predictions with recent measurements

To test the diameter predictions of our model, we computed the diameter of eight stars, which had recently been measured by interferometry and not used for the polynomial fit. Figure 4 shows the computed diameters as a function of the measured ones. The agreement is excellent, with a mean-squared difference between measured and computed diameters that is expressed in noise units of about 0.5.



Fig. 3. Differential surface brightness for (from top to bottom) the (V, J), (V, H) and (V, Ks), photometric pairs versus spectral type. The (V, J) and (V, Ks) curves have been shifted by ±0.2 for clarity. The entries were binned, with an interval of 2.5 subspectral type. The dotted lines represent the best fit with polynomials of degree 6. Note that the spectral metric is not smooth (see text).

5.4. The JMMC stellar diameter catalogue

We used the present formalism to compute the angular diameters of stars in the Tycho2 catalog[7] (Høg et al. 2000) with known spectral type. The resulting median diameter error is 1.1%. About 453 000 stars have an associated internal diameter χ^2_θ less than 5, and 393 000 less than 2.

5.5. Simplified formula

For a star which could be absent in the JMMC catalog and for which two tycho-like magnitudes and a spectral type are known, it is easy to derive a diameter estimate using the formula below.

Knowing the DSB polynomial values p and their errors σ_p, the stellar diameter (mas) and its relative error may quickly be computed using the following formulas:

$$\log(\theta) = -0.2 \times \frac{c_V\, m_X - c_X\, m_V}{c_V - c_X} + p \qquad (9)$$

and

$$\frac{\sigma(\theta)}{\theta} = \ln(10)\, \sqrt{0.04 \times \frac{c_V^2 \sigma^2(m_X) + c_X^2 \sigma^2(m_V)}{(c_X - c_V)^2} + \sigma_p^2}, \qquad (10)$$

with X=J, H or Ks. Table 1 provides the pair (p, σ_p) for the (V,Ks) photometries and stars of spectral type O5 to M6.

It is also possible to estimate angular diameters without a precise knowledge of the spectral type, but with a degraded precision. For a star whose spectral type is known within some range, it suffices to replace in Eq. 9 and Eq. 10, the pair (p, σ_p) by the pair (a, σ_a), where a is the mean value of p, and σ_a its dispersion over the spectral range. If the spectral type is in the range O5–M6, then for any X, (a, σ_a)=(0.56, 0.12), for the range A0–M6, (a, σ_a)=(0.62, 0.05), which respectively provides 28% and 12% diameter error.

6. Conclusion

Our approach to predict stellar angular diameters is based on the modeling of the relationship between angular diameters and pho-

[7] See the JSDC catalog at http://www.jmmc.fr/jsdc. The Tycho2 catalog is used here as a list of star positions and photometries are retrieved through GetStar, as described in Sect. 4.3.



Fig. 4. Computed diameters as a function of measured diameters, for eight stars recently observed with interferometry and not used for the polynomial fit. Stars with increasing diameter, HD numbers: 209458 (G0V), 189733 (K1.5V), 69830 (G8), 185351 (G9III), 190658 (M2.5III), 183589 (K5I), 95687 (M3I), 97671 (M3I), (Johnson et al. 2014; Boffin et al. 2014; Tanner et al. 2015; Boyajian et al. 2015; Arroyo-Torres et al. 2015). The agreement is excellent, with a mean-squared difference between measured and computed diameters expressed in noise units of 0.5. The straight dotted line corresponds to x=y.

tometries. We developed a new methodology that is based on two reddening-free observables: 1) a distance indicator called pseudomagnitude and 2) the differential surface brightness, a handy quasi-experimental observable, that is independent of distance and specific to each star. This, together with our new database of measured angular diameters, allows us to provide estimates of star diameters with statistical errors of ∼ 1.1%, plus possible biases of ∼ 2%. It permits us to upgrade the JSDC catalog of stellar diameters to about 453 000 stars, a tenfold improvement in number of stars and diameter precision.

The polynomial method developed in this work may be used with any photometric system, selecting optical bands that best represent the stellar continuum. However, the exercise has severe limits because the DSB is not smooth. The only way to reduce the biases and to go beyond 1% error is to measure its structure for all spectral types and luminosity classes. This emphasises this importance to get precise photometry with biases smaller than 1% and above all the importance of optical interferometry to get precise and numerous angular diameters.

Acknowledgements. This research has made use of NASA's Astrophysics Data System. This research has made use of the SIMBAD database (Wenger et al. 2000), and of the VizieR catalog access tool (Ochsenbein et al. 2000), CDS, Strasbourg, France. The TOPCAT tool[8](Taylor 2005) was pivotal in the analysis and filtering of our databases. This publication makes use of data products from the Two Micron All Sky Survey, which is a joint project of the University of Massachusetts and the Infrared Processing and Analysis Center/California Institute of Technology, funded by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the National Science Foundation.

SP Type	p	σ_p	SP Type	p	σ_p
O5	0.2432	0.0443	F6	0.5810	0.0025
O6	0.2534	0.0337	F7	0.5822	0.0024
O7	0.2670	0.0255	F8	0.5835	0.0023
O8	0.2830	0.0192	F9	0.5850	0.0022
O9	0.3009	0.0147	G0	0.5867	0.0021
B0	0.3201	0.0116	G1	0.5888	0.0020
B1	0.3401	0.0096	G2	0.5912	0.0020
B2	0.3603	0.0085	G3	0.5939	0.0019
B3	0.3805	0.0077	G4	0.5971	0.0019
B4	0.4003	0.0071	G5	0.6006	0.0019
B5	0.4195	0.0067	G6	0.6045	0.0019
B6	0.4378	0.0062	G7	0.6088	0.0019
B7	0.4551	0.0059	G8	0.6134	0.0020
B8	0.4712	0.0055	G9	0.6183	0.0020
B9	0.4862	0.0053	K0	0.6235	0.0021
A0	0.4998	0.0051	K1	0.6289	0.0021
A1	0.5121	0.0050	K2	0.6345	0.0022
A2	0.5231	0.0049	K3	0.6402	0.0023
A3	0.5329	0.0048	K4	0.6460	0.0025
A4	0.5414	0.0047	K5	0.6518	0.0026
A5	0.5488	0.0046	K6	0.6575	0.0028
A6	0.5551	0.0045	K7	0.6632	0.0029
A7	0.5604	0.0043	K8	0.6686	0.0030
A8	0.5648	0.0041	K9	0.6739	0.0031
A9	0.5684	0.0039	M0	0.6790	0.0029
F0	0.5714	0.0037	M1	0.6838	0.0026
F1	0.5738	0.0034	M2	0.6884	0.0023
F2	0.5757	0.0032	M3	0.6928	0.0025
F3	0.5773	0.0030	M4	0.6971	0.0039
F4	0.5786	0.0028	M5	0.7012	0.0065
F5	0.5798	0.0026	M6	0.7054	0.0104

Table 1. Differential surface brightness polynomial values p and associated errors σ_p for stars measured in the (V, Ks) photometric pair. The angular diameter (mas) and its statistical relative error may be obtained from Eq. 9 and Eq. 10, replacing X by Ks.

References

Africano, J. L., Evans, D. S., Fekel, F. C., & Ferland, G. J. 1976, AJ, 81, 650
Africano, J. L., Evans, D. S., Fekel, F. C., & Montemayor, T. 1977, AJ, 82, 631
Africano, J. L., Evans, D. S., Fekel, F. C., Smith, B. W., & Morgan, C. A. 1978, AJ, 83, 1100
Arroyo-Torres, B., Martí-Vidal, I., Marcaide, J. M., et al. 2014, A&A, 566, A88
Arroyo-Torres, B., Wittkowski, M., Chiavassa, A., et al. 2015, A&A, 575, A50
Baines, E. K., Armstrong, J. T., Schmitt, H. R., et al. 2014, in SPIE Conference Series, Vol. 9146, Optical and Infrared Interferometry IV
Baines, E. K., Döllinger, M. P., Cusano, F., et al. 2010, ApJ, 710, 1365
Baines, E. K., McAlister, H. A., ten Brummelaar, T. A., et al. 2009, ApJ, 701, 154
Baines, E. K., McAlister, H. A., ten Brummelaar, T. A., et al. 2008, ApJ, 680, 728
Barnes, T. G. & Evans, D. S. 1976, MNRAS, 174, 489
Beavers, W. I., Cadmus, R. R., & Eitter, J. J. 1982, AJ, 87, 818
Beavers, W. I. & Eitter, J. 1979, ApJ, 228, L111
Beavers, W. I., Eitter, J. J., & Cadmus, Jr., R. R. 1981, AJ, 86, 1404
Beavers, W. I., Eitter, J. J., Dunham, D. W., & Stein, W. L. 1980, AJ, 85, 1505
Blackwell, D. E., Shallis, M. J., & Selby, M. J. 1979, MNRAS, 188, 847
Boehme, D. 1978, Astronomische Nachrichten, 299, 243
Boffin, H. M. J., Hillen, M., Berger, J. P., et al. 2014, A&A, 564, A1
Bonneau, D., Clausse, J.-M., Delfosse, X., et al. 2006, A&A, 456, 789
Bonneau, D., Delfosse, X., Mourard, D., et al. 2011, A&A, 535, A53
Bonneau, D., Koechlin, L., Oneto, J. L., & Vakili, F. 1981, A&A, 103, 28
Boyajian, T., von Braun, K., Feiden, G. A., et al. 2015, MNRAS, 447, 846
Boyajian, T. S. 2014, private communication
Boyajian, T. S., McAlister, H. A., Baines, E. K., et al. 2008, ApJ, 683, 424
Boyajian, T. S., McAlister, H. A., van Belle, G., et al. 2012a, ApJ, 746, 101
Boyajian, T. S., van Belle, G., & von Braun, K. 2014, AJ, 147, 47
Boyajian, T. S., von Braun, K., van Belle, G., et al. 2013, ApJ, 771, 40
Boyajian, T. S., von Braun, K., van Belle, G., et al. 2012b, ApJ, 757, 112
Brown, A., Bunclark, P. S., Stapleton, J. R., & Stewart, G. C. 1979, MNRAS, 187, 753
Brown, T. M. & Gilliland, R. L. 1994, ARA&A, 32, 37
Casagrande, L., Portinari, L., Glass, I. S., et al. 2014, MNRAS, 439, 2060
Casagrande, L., Ramírez, I., Meléndez, J., Bessell, M., & Asplund, M. 2010, A&A, 512, A54
Challouf, M., Nardetto, N., Mourard, D., et al. 2014, A&A, 570, A104

[8] available at http://www.starlink.ac.uk/topcat/

Name	Ref(s)	Name	Ref(s)	Name	Ref(s)	Name	Ref(s)	Name	Ref(s)	Name	Ref(s)
GJ411	59	GJ412A	75	GJ649	82	GJ687	75	HD100029	57, 63, 83	HD100920	19
HD1013	83	HD10144	9	HD101501	74	HD102212	43, 57, 63, 83	HD102328	72	HD102647	9, 66
HD102870	74	HD103605	72	HD10380	36, 56	HD10476	77	HD104985	69	HD106574	72
HD106625	9	HD10697	69, 77	HD107383	82	HD10780	70, 74	HD108907	83	HD109358	74, 83
HD112300	63	HD113049	72	HD113226	56, 63, 83	HD113996	83	HD114710	74	HD114961	36, 43
HD115617	82	HD115659	80	HD117176	69	HD117675	83	HD118904	72	HD119149	23
HD11964	69, 77	HD11977	73	HD119850	75	HD120136	69	HD120477	56, 83	HD121130	83
HD121370	57, 63, 67	HD123139	61	HD123934	14, 16, 22	HD12479	14, 37, 50, 54	HD12533	32, 63	HD126660	74
HD127665	83	HD128167	74	HD12929	40, 46, 48, 56, 63	HD129712	83	HD130948	77	HD131156	74
HD131873	40, 63	HD13189	69	HD131977	65	HD132112	36, 43	HD1326	58, 59, 75	HD132813	63
HD133124	83	HD133208	57, 63, 83	HD133774	23	HD135722	56, 63	HD136202	77	HD136726	72, 83
HD137443	72	HD137759	83	HD138265	72	HD139357	72	HD139663	12	HD140538	77
HD140573	57, 63, 83	HD141795	74	HD142804	36	HD142860	74	HD143107	83	HD143761	69, 82
HD144690	50	HD145675	69	HD146051	63, 78	HD146233	74	HD148387	57, 63, 83	HD148478	47, 63
HD149661	75	HD150383	49	HD150680	57, 63	HD150798	78	HD150997	56, 63, 83	HD1522	83
HD152786	78	HD154345	71	HD156283	46, 56, 63	HD157214	77	HD157681	72	HD158633	77
HD159181	63	HD159561	9	HD160290	72	HD161096	83	HD16141	71	HD16160	58, 59, 75
HD161797	63	HD162003	74	HD163770	63	HD163917	83	HD164058	40, 41, 44, 46, 63	HD164259	74
HD167042	72	HD16765	77	HD168151	77	HD16895	74	HD168988	36	HD169022	9
HD170693	72, 83	HD172167	1, 9, 63	HD172816	17, 23, 29, 34, 36, 37, 55	HD17361	56	HD173667	74	HD17506	63
HD175588	51, 63	HD175726	76	HD175775	18	HD175823	72	HD175865	51, 63	HD176124	36
HD176408	72	HD176411	56	HD176437	79, 81	HD176524	83	HD176678	83	HD17709	63
HD177153	76	HD177724	74	HD177756	81	HD177830	69	HD180540	34, 55	HD180610	83
HD180711	40, 57, 63	HD180809	46, 56	HD181276	56, 83	HD181420	76	HD18191	16, 35	HD182572	74
HD183439	46, 63, 83	HD184171	81	HD185144	70, 74	HD185395	74	HD186408	77	HD186427	69, 77
HD186791	56, 63	HD186815	72	HD186882	81	HD187082	23	HD187637	76	HD188512	56
HD190228	69	HD190360	69	HD190406	76	HD19058	44, 51, 63	HD192781	72	HD19373	74
HD193924	1, 9	HD194093	56, 63	HD195564	77	HD195820	72	HD196777	4, 30, 36	HD197345	32, 63
HD19787	56	HD197989	48, 63	HD198149	56	HD199305	75	HD199665	71	HD19994	69
HD200205	72	HD200905	56, 63	HD201092	68	HD202109	63	HD202850	79	HD203504	83
HD204724	63	HD205435	56	HD20630	74	HD206778	57, 63	HD206860	77	HD206952	83
HD207005	12	HD20902	32, 56, 63	HD209100	65	HD209750	56, 63	HD209950	29	HD209952	1, 9
HD210027	76	HD21019	77	HD210418	74	HD210702	71, 82	HD210745	63	HD212496	56, 83
HD213306	53, 56	HD213558	74	HD214868	56, 72	HD214923	81	HD215648	74	HD215665	56, 63
HD216032	43	HD216131	56, 63	HD216386	2, 63	HD216956	1, 9, 66	HD217014	69, 77	HD217906	44, 46, 48, 51, 52, 63, 80
HD218329	83	HD218356	63	HD218396	76	HD219080	79	HD219134	75	HD219576	36
HD219615	83	HD219623	77	HD221115	56	HD221345	71	HD222368	74	HD222603	77
HD224062	19, 37	HD22484	74	HD224935	64	HD23249	67	HD23319	73	HD23596	69
HD24398	81	HD24512	78	HD25025	63	HD25604	56	HD25705	78	HD27256	73
HD285968	82	HD29139	8, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 33, 38, 41, 42, 44, 48, 51, 63	HD30959	78	HD31398	63	HD31767	63	HD31964	63
HD32518	72	HD32630	79	HD33564	82	HD3360	79	HD33793	59	HD34085	1, 9
HD34411	74	HD3546	56	HD35468	1, 9, 81	HD3627	48, 57, 63	HD36389	31, 36, 37, 39, 78	HD36395	59, 75
HD3651	69	HD36673	56	HD36848	73	HD3712	32, 46, 48, 56, 63	HD37128	1, 9	HD38529	69
HD38858	77	HD38944	83	HD39983	43, 54	HD40239	51, 63	HD4128	78	HD42995	60
HD432	56	HD44478	6, 7, 10, 11, 21, 35, 41, 44, 51, 63	HD45348	1, 9, 78	HD45410	71	HD4628	75	HD4656	50
HD48329	13, 43, 45, 50, 56, 63	HD48915	1, 9, 62, 63	HD49933	76	HD49968	30	HD5015	74	HD52089	1, 9
HD5395	56	HD5448	79	HD54605	9	HD54719	83	HD56537	74	HD57423	35
HD5820	23	HD58350	9	HD58946	74	HD59686	69	HD60294	72	HD6210	77
HD62345	83	HD66141	83	HD66811	3, 9	HD6860	32, 41, 44, 46, 48, 51, 63	HD69267	56, 63	HD69897	77
HD70272	46	HD7087	56	HD73108	72	HD74442	36	HD76294	57, 83	HD76827	63
HD79211	75	HD7924	82	HD80007	9	HD8019	23	HD80493	46, 57, 63	HD81797	63, 78
HD81937	74	HD82308	83	HD82885	74	HD83618	83	HD84194	83	HD84441	57, 63
HD8512	83	HD85503	83	HD86663	18, 23, 56	HD86728	74	HD87837	13, 15, 21, 29, 56	HD87901	1, 9
HD88230	58, 59, 75	HD89449	76, 79	HD89758	57, 63	HD90839	74	HD91232	43	HD9138	45
HD9408	56	HD95418	74	HD95608	79	HD95735	58, 58, 75, 75	HD96833	57, 63, 83	HD97603	74
HD97633	79	HD9826	69	HD98262	63	HD9927	46, 56	HD99998	5, 20, 56	HR4518	56
HR9045	56										

Table 2. List of stars and associated references of angular diameter measurements that have been retained to calibrate the DSB in this work.

References. (1) Hanbury Brown et al. (1967); (2) Nather et al. (1970); (3) Davis et al. (1970); (4) Dunham et al. (1973); (5) Dunham et al. (1974); (6) White (1974); (7) Ridgway et al. (1974); (8) Currie et al. (1974); (9) Hanbury Brown et al. (1974); (10) Dunham et al. (1975); (11) Nelson (1975); (12) Harwood et al. (1975); (13) de Vegt (1976); (14) Africano et al. (1976); (15) Glass & Morrison (1976); (16) Ridgway et al. (1977); (17) Africano et al. (1977); (18) Vilas & Lasker (1977); (19) Africano et al. (1978); (20) White (1978b); (21) Boehme (1978); (22) White (1978a); (23) Ridgway et al. (1979); (24) White (1979); (25) Beavers & Eitter (1979); (26) Brown et al. (1979); (27) Panek & Leap (1980); (28) Evans et al. (1980); (29) Ridgway et al. (1980a); (30) Beavers et al. (1980); (31) White (1980); (32) Bonneau et al. (1981); (33) Radick & Africano (1981); (34) Evans & Edwards (1981); (35) Beavers et al. (1981); (36) Ridgway et al. (1982a); (37) Beavers et al. (1982); (38) Ridgway et al. (1982b); (39) White et al. (1982); (40) Faucherre et al. (1983); (41) di Benedetto & Conti (1983); (42) White & Kreidl (1984); (43) Schmidtke et al. (1986); (44) di Benedetto & Rabbia (1987); (45) Stecklum (1987); (46) Hutter et al. (1989); (47) Richichi & Lisi (1990); (48) Mozurkewich et al. (1991); (49) Richichi et al. (1992b); (50) Richichi et al. (1992a); (51) Quirrenbach et al. (1993); (52) Dyck et al. (1995); (53) Mourard et al. (1997); (54) Ragland et al. (1997); (55) Richichi et al. (1998); (56) Nordgren et al. (1999); (57) Nordgren et al. (2001); (58) Lane et al. (2001); (59) Ségransan et al. (2003); (60) Richichi & Calamai (2003); (61) Kervella et al. (2003b); (62) Kervella et al. (2003a); (63) Mozurkewich et al. (2003); (64) Fors et al. (2004); (65) Kervella et al. (2004); (66) Di Folco et al. (2004); (67) Thévenin et al. (2005); (68) Kervella et al. (2008); (69) Baines et al. (2008); (70) Boyajian et al. (2008); (71) Baines et al. (2009); (72) Baines et al. (2010); (73) Cusano et al. (2012); (74) Boyajian et al. (2012a); (75) Boyajian et al. (2012b); (76) Boyajian (2014); (77) Boyajian et al. (2013); (78) Cruzalèbes et al. (2013); (79) Maestro et al. (2013); (80) Arroyo-Torres et al. (2014); (81) Challouf et al. (2014); (82) von Braun et al. (2014); (83) Baines et al. (2014).

Chaplin, W. J. & Miglio, A. 2013, ARA&A, 51, 353
Claret, A. 2000, A&A, 363, 1081
Cousins, A. W. J. & Guelke, G. 1950, Monthly Notes of the Astronomical Society of South Africa, 9, 36
Cruzalèbes, P., Jorissen, A., Rabbia, Y., et al. 2013, MNRAS, 434, 437
Currie, D. G., Knapp, S. L., & Liewer, K. M. 1974, ApJ, 187, 131
Cusano, F., Paladini, C., Richichi, A., et al. 2012, A&A, 539, A58
Davis, J., Morton, D. C., Allen, L. R., & Hanbury Brown, R. 1970, MNRAS, 150, 45
de Bruijne, J. H. J. 2012, Ap&SS, 341, 31
de Vegt, C. 1976, A&A, 47, 457
di Benedetto, G. P. & Conti, G. 1983, ApJ, 268, 309
di Benedetto, G. P. & Rabbia, Y. 1987, A&A, 188, 114
Di Folco, E., Thévenin, F., Kervella, P., et al. 2004, A&A, 426, 601
Dunham, D. W., Evans, D. S., & Sandmann, W. H. 1974, AJ, 79, 483
Dunham, D. W., Evans, D. S., Silverberg, E. C., & Wiant, J. R. 1973, AJ, 78, 199
Dunham, D. W., Evans, D. S., & Vogt, S. S. 1975, AJ, 80, 45
Dyck, H. M., Benson, J. A., Carleton, N. P., et al. 1995, AJ, 109, 378
ESA. 1997, The Hipparcos and Tycho Catalogues, Vol. 1 (ESA SP-1200)
Evans, D. S. & Edwards, D. A. 1981, AJ, 86, 1277
Evans, D. S., Edwards, D. A., Pettersen, B. R., et al. 1980, AJ, 85, 1262
Faucherre, M., Bonneau, D., Koechlin, L., & Vakili, F. 1983, A&A, 120, 263
Fitzpatrick, E. L. 1999, PASP, 111, 63
Fors, O., Richichi, A., Núñez, J., & Prades, A. 2004, A&A, 419, 285
Glass, I. S. & Morrison, L. V. 1976, MNRAS, 175, 57P
Hanbury Brown, R., Davis, J., & Allen, L. R. 1974, MNRAS, 167, 121
Hanbury Brown, R., Davis, J., Allen, L. R., & Rome, J. M. 1967, MNRAS, 137, 393
Hanbury Brown, R. & Twiss, R. Q. 1958, Royal Society of London Proceedings Series A, 248, 222
Harwood, J. M., Nather, R. E., Walker, A. R., Warner, B., & Wild, P. A. T. 1975, MNRAS, 170, 229
Hindsley, R. B. & Bell, R. A. 1989, ApJ, 341, 1004
Høg, E., Fabricius, C., Makarov, V. V., et al. 2000, A&A, 355, L27
Huber, D., Chaplin, W. J., Christensen-Dalsgaard, J., et al. 2013, ApJ, 767, 127
Hutter, D. J., Johnston, K. J., Mozurkewich, D., et al. 1989, ApJ, 340, 1103
Johnson, J. A., Huber, D., Boyajian, T., et al. 2014, ApJ, 794, 15
Kervella, P., Mérand, A., Pichon, B., et al. 2008, A&A, 488, 667
Kervella, P., Thévenin, F., Di Folco, E., & Ségransan, D. 2004, A&A, 426, 297
Kervella, P., Thévenin, F., Morel, P., Bordé, P., & Di Folco, E. 2003a, A&A, 408, 681
Kervella, P., Thévenin, F., Ségransan, D., et al. 2003b, A&A, 404, 1087
Kharchenko, N. V. 2001, Kinematika i Fizika Nebesnykh Tel, 17, 409
Labeyrie, A. 1975, ApJ, 196, L71
Lafrasse, S., Mella, G., Bonneau, D., et al. 2010, in SPIE Conference Series, Vol. 7734, Optical and Infrared Interferometry II
Lane, B. F., Boden, A. F., & Kulkarni, S. R. 2001, ApJ, 551, L81
Maestro, V., Che, X., Huber, D., et al. 2013, MNRAS, 434, 1321
McCall, M. L. 2004, AJ, 128, 2144
Michelson, A. A. & Pease, F. G. 1921, ApJ, 53, 249
Mourard, D., Bonneau, D., Koechlin, L., et al. 1997, A&A, 317, 789
Mozurkewich, D., Armstrong, J. T., Hindsley, R. B., et al. 2003, AJ, 126, 2502
Mozurkewich, D., Johnston, K. J., Simon, R. S., et al. 1991, AJ, 101, 2207
Nather, R. E., McCants, M. M., & Evans, D. S. 1970, ApJ, 160, L181
Neilson, H. R. & Lester, J. B. 2013a, A&A, 554, A98
Neilson, H. R. & Lester, J. B. 2013b, A&A, 556, A86
Nelson, M. R. 1975, ApJ, 198, 127
Nordgren, T. E., Germain, M. E., Benson, J. A., et al. 1999, AJ, 118, 3032
Nordgren, T. E., Sudol, J. J., & Mozurkewich, D. 2001, AJ, 122, 2707
Ochsenbein, F., Bauer, P., & Marcout, J. 2000, A&AS, 143, 23
Panek, R. J. & Leap, J. L. 1980, AJ, 85, 47
Pasinetti Fracassini, L. E., Pastori, L., Covino, S., & Pozzi, A. 2001, A&A, 367, 521
Perrin, G. 2003, A&A, 400, 1173
Quirrenbach, A., Mozurkewich, D., Armstrong, J. T., Buscher, D. F., & Hummel, C. A. 1993, ApJ, 406, 215
Radick, R. R. & Africano, J. L. 1981, AJ, 86, 906
Ragland, S., Chandrasekhar, T., & Ashok, N. M. 1997, MNRAS, 287, 681
Richichi, A. & Calamai, G. 2003, A&A, 399, 275
Richichi, A., di Giacomo, A., Lisi, F., & Calamai, G. 1992a, A&A, 265, 535
Richichi, A. & Lisi, F. 1990, A&A, 230, 355
Richichi, A., Lisi, F., & di Giacomo, A. 1992b, A&A, 254, 149
Richichi, A., Percheron, I., & Khristoforova, M. 2005, A&A, 431, 773
Richichi, A., Ragland, S., & Fabbroni, L. 1998, A&A, 330, 578
Ridgway, S. T., Jacoby, G. H., Joyce, R. R., Siegel, M. J., & Wells, D. C. 1982a, AJ, 87, 808
Ridgway, S. T., Jacoby, G. H., Joyce, R. R., Siegel, M. J., & Wells, D. C. 1982b, AJ, 87, 1044
Ridgway, S. T., Jacoby, G. H., Joyce, R. R., & Wells, D. C. 1980a, AJ, 85, 1496
Ridgway, S. T., Joyce, R. R., White, N. M., & Wing, R. F. 1980b, ApJ, 235, 126
Ridgway, S. T., Wells, D. C., & Carbon, D. F. 1974, AJ, 79, 1079
Ridgway, S. T., Wells, D. C., & Joyce, R. R. 1977, AJ, 82, 414
Ridgway, S. T., Wells, D. C., Joyce, R. R., & Allen, R. G. 1979, AJ, 84, 247
Schmidtke, P. C., Africano, J. L., Jacoby, G. H., Joyce, R. R., & Ridgway, S. T. 1986, AJ, 91, 961
Ségransan, D., Kervella, P., Forveille, T., & Queloz, D. 2003, A&A, 397, L5
Simon, M. & Schaefer, G. H. 2011, ApJ, 743, 158
Skrutskie, M. F., Cutri, R. M., Stiening, R., et al. 2006, AJ, 131, 1163
Stecklum, B. 1987, AJ, 94, 201
Tanner, A., Boyajian, T. S., von Braun, K., et al. 2015, ApJ, 800, 115
Taylor, M. B. 2005, in Astronomical Society of the Pacific Conference Series, Vol. 347, Astronomical Data Analysis Software and Systems XIV, ed. P. Shopbell, M. Britton, & R. Ebert, 29
Thévenin, F., Kervella, P., Pichon, B., et al. 2005, A&A, 436, 253
van Leeuwen, F., Evans, D. W., Grenon, M., et al. 1997, A&A, 323, L61
Vilas, F. & Lasker, B. M. 1977, PASP, 89, 95
von Braun, K., Boyajian, T. S., van Belle, G. T., et al. 2014, MNRAS, 438, 2413
Wenger, M., Ochsenbein, F., Egret, D., et al. 2000, A&AS, 143, 9
Wesselink, A. J. 1969, MNRAS, 144, 297
White, N. M. 1974, AJ, 79, 1076
White, N. M. 1978a, in IAU Symposium, Vol. 80, The HR Diagram - The 100th Anniversary of Henry Norris Russell, ed. A. G. D. Philip & D. S. Hayes, 447–450
White, N. M. 1978b, AJ, 83, 1639
White, N. M. 1979, AJ, 84, 872
White, N. M. 1980, ApJ, 242, 646
White, N. M. & Kreidl, T. J. 1984, AJ, 89, 424
White, N. M., Kreidl, T. J., & Goldberg, L. 1982, ApJ, 254, 670

Appendix A: Linear least squares fit

The data consist of a set of N_S stars that are characterized by their measured diameter θ (corrected for limb-darkening) and N_B observed magnitudes. Each star provides $N_B - 1$ linearly independent pseudomagnitude, which combined with the diameter θ, give $N_B - 1$ correlated measurements (differential surface brightness) per star. Each measurement is fitted as a function of the stellar spectral type number (from 0 to 69 for O0 to M9) with a polynomial of degree m. The problem is then to evaluate $(m + 1) \times (N_B - 1)$ polynomial coefficients, which we do via a simple linear least squares fit, described below.

Appendix A.1: Polynomials calculation

We align the $(N_B - 1) \times N_S$ measurements in a vector $\mathbf{M}$, and we define the transition matrix $\mathbf{T}$ of dimensions $(N_B - 1).N_S \times (m + 1).(N_B - 1)$ as the derivative of $\mathbf{M}$ with respect to the unknowns. For simplicity, we assume that the N_S stars are distinct, implying no correlations between the measurements of different stars. This allows us to define N_S independent covariance matrices $\mathbf{C}_i, i = 0, 1, ..., N_S - 1$,of dimension $(N_B - 1) \times (N_B - 1)$. Given the photometric pairs that were selected in this work (V, J),(V, H),(V, Ks), the generic expression of the covariance matrix is

$$\mathbf{C} = \frac{\sigma_\theta^2}{\theta^2 \ln(10)^2} + 0.04\times, \qquad \text{(A.1)}$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} \frac{c_J^2\sigma_V^2+c_V^2\sigma_J^2}{(c_V-c_J)^2} & \frac{c_J c_H \sigma_V^2}{(c_V-c_J)\times(c_V-c_H)} & \frac{c_J c_{Ks}\sigma_V^2}{(c_V-c_J)\times(c_V-c_{Ks})} \\ \frac{c_J c_H \sigma_V^2}{(c_V-c_J)\times(c_V-c_H)} & \frac{c_H^2\sigma_V^2+c_V^2\sigma_H^2}{(c_V-c_H)^2} & \frac{c_H c_{Ks}\sigma_V^2}{(c_V-c_H)\times(c_V-c_{Ks})} \\ \frac{c_J c_{Ks}\sigma_V^2}{(c_V-c_J)\times(c_V-c_{Ks})} & \frac{c_H c_{Ks}\sigma_V^2}{(c_V-c_H)\times(c_V-c_{Ks})} & \frac{c_{Ks}^2\sigma_V^2+c_V^2\sigma_{Ks}^2}{(c_V-c_{Ks})^2} \end{bmatrix}$$

where θ is the measured diameter and σ_θ its error, $(\sigma_V, \sigma_J, \sigma_H, \sigma_{Ks})$, and (c_V, c_J, c_H, c_{Ks}) are the magnitude errors and the interstellar extinction coefficients in the corresponding bands. Next we place the inverse of the covariance matrices $\{\mathbf{C}_i^{-1}\}$ along the diagonal of a matrix $\mathbf{D}$ of dimensions

$(N_B-1).N_S \times (N_B-1).N_S$. The solution for the polynomial coefficients is contained in a vector **A** of dimensions $(m+1)\times(N_B-1)$, given by

$$\mathbf{A} = \left[{}^t\mathbf{T} \times \mathbf{D} \times \mathbf{T}\right]^{-1} \times {}^t\mathbf{T} \times \mathbf{D} \times \mathbf{V}. \quad (A.2)$$

The covariance matrix $\mathbf{C}_a$ of the solution **A** is

$$\mathbf{C}_a = \left[{}^t\mathbf{T} \times \mathbf{D} \times \mathbf{T}\right]^{-1}. \quad (A.3)$$

The reconstructed measurement vector writes: $\mathbf{M}_r = \mathbf{T} \times \mathbf{A}$, and the reduced χ^2_p of the fitting process is

$$\chi^2_p = \frac{{}^t(\mathbf{M} - \mathbf{M}_r) \times \mathbf{D} \times (\mathbf{M} - \mathbf{M}_r)}{N_S \times (N_B - 1)}. \quad (A.4)$$

Appendix A.2: Diameter calculation

For a given star with a spectral type number n_s and an associated pseudomagnitude vector **P** of dimension $N_B - 1$, the reconstructed *iest* ($i = 0, ...N_B - 1$) diameter θ_i is given by

$$\log(\theta_i) = \sum_{k=0}^{k=m} \mathbf{A}[k + i \times (m + 1)] \times n_s^k - 0.2 \times \mathbf{P}(i). \quad (A.5)$$

The covariance matrix $\mathbf{C}_d$ between log diameter estimates writes

$$\mathbf{C}_d[\log(\theta_i), \log(\theta_j)] = 0.04\,\mathrm{cov}[\mathbf{P}(i), \mathbf{P}(j)] + . \quad (A.6)$$
$$\sum_{k=0}^{k=m}\sum_{l=0}^{l=m} \mathbf{C}_a[k + i \times (m + 1), l + j \times (m + 1)] \times n_s^{k+l}$$

Let us range the $N_B - 1$ log diameter estimates within a vector **R**. The mean log diameter $\overline{\log(\theta)}$ and the associated error are

$$\overline{\log(\theta)} = \frac{\sum \mathbf{C}_d^{-1} \times \mathbf{R}}{\sum \mathbf{C}_d^{-1}} \quad (A.7)$$

$$\sigma[\overline{\log(\theta)}] = \left[\sum \mathbf{C}_d^{-1}\right]^{-0.5}, \quad (A.8)$$

where $\sum$ stands for the sum of all the matrix elements. The mean diameter $\overline{\theta}$ and its error are computed as follows:

$$\overline{\theta} = 10^{\overline{\log(\theta)}} \quad (A.9)$$

$$\sigma(\overline{\theta}) = \ln(10)\,\sigma[\overline{\log(\theta)}] \times \overline{\theta}. \quad (A.10)$$

At last, we define the chi-square χ^2_θ associated with the reconstructed log diameter (from the database) by

$$\chi^2_\theta = \frac{{}^t\mathbf{B} \times [\mathbf{C}_d + \sigma^2_\theta]^{-1} \times \mathbf{B}}{N_B - 1}, \quad (A.11)$$

where **B** is the vector of the difference between the log of the diameter estimates (**R**) and that of the measured diameter, and σ_θ is the error of the measured log diameter. In the case of a catalog of stars with no measured diameter, we can define an internal χ^2_θ, replacing the measured diameter and its error with the mean computed diameter and its error.